

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,990	SANTA ANA, ROLAND C	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alvin J. Grant	3723	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alvin J. Grant. (3)_____

(2) Mr.Keith Blankenship. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 16 July 2007.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 17 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patents: 83,897 (Zimmerman), 6,571,666 (Te) and 6,283,449 (Hu),.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Blankenship indicated that the Zimmerman reference did not disclose apically rounded flared claws (as shown in Fig. 4(a) and 4(b) of Applicant's drawings. He further stated that the reason for the head being round (Fig. 4(a)) is that it precludes the occurrence of a work surface being marred, by the hammer head, while a nail was being extracted. In the case of the claw (Fig. 4(b)) one of the claws would be pointed away from the work surface while the other claw is pulling the nail; hence the work surface would not be scratched by the inactive claw when a nail was being pulled. It was brought to Mr. Blankenship's attention that Fig. 4(a) addresses the head of the hammer and not the claw, so that feature was not being claimed.

Regarding the flared claws (Fig. 4(b)) the hammer head of Zimmerman shown in Fig. 3, shows flared claws; however, Figs. 1 and 2 of Zimmerman show the tip of the claws to be equal in length which would contradict what is shown in Fig. 3 (of Zimmerman). For this reason the previous Final Rejection was withdrawn and that the Application would be reexamined.